26

27

28

Place:

Complaint Filed: March 3, 2017

I. OBJECTIONS OF PLAINTIFF, DR. ADEL F. SAMAAN TO DECLARATIONS OF WENDY GOMPPER AND EMILY RUSSELL

- A. Objections to Wendy Gompper declaration par. 4-19, page 2 ln. 25 to p. 5 ln. 21:
- (1) This declaration language constitutes an after-the-fact assertion by the witness of claim handling determination evidence which was not transmitted to Dr. Samaan during the course of the adminstrative claim review process. Such evidence is barred by *Spinedex Physical Therapy USA Inc. v. United Healthcare of Arizona, Inc.*, 770 F.3d 1282 (9th Cir. 2014) and *Harlick v. Blue Shield of California*, 686 F. 3d 699, 719-720 (9th Cir. 2012)

Objection: (2) No personal knowledge; the witness is merely interpreting Cigna file documents and is not identified as a percipient witness involved in the claim review process.

- B. Objections to Emily Russell declaration par 35-91, page 8 ln. 4 to p. 19 ln. 6:
- (1) This declaration language constitutes an after-the-fact assertion by the witness of claim handling determination evidence which was not transmitted to Dr. Samaan during the course of the administrative claim review process. Such evidence is barred by *Spinedex Physical Therapy USA Inc. v. United Healthcare of Arizona, Inc.*, 770 F.3d 1282 (9th Cir. 2014) and *Harlick v. Blue Shield of California*, 686 F. 3d 699, 719-720 (9th Cir. 2012)

Objection: (2) No personal knowledge; the witness is merely interpreting Cigna file documents and is not identified as a percipient witness involved in the claim review process.

Dated: November 5, 2018 Respectfully submitted,

LYTTON & WILLIAMS LLP

By: /s/ Richard D. Williams
Richard D. Williams,
Attorneys for Plaintiff, Adel F. Samaan, M.D.